

## SOME REMARKS 4

Upon a Book, entitled, *Christ's Lambs defended against Satan's rage, &c. Being the Quakers Answer to The Quakers Unmask'd, &c.*

In a Letter to E. S. Esq;

*Penman*

-LICENSED, June 19. 1691.

S I R,

**H**AVING had the curiosity and opportunity of reading, *The Quakers Unmask'd, Their Double dealing and False-heartedness discovered, &c.* I thought it impossible for the Quakers to vindicate themselves from that Authors Charge; which made me desirous to read their Answer; and being perused it, I can scarce forbear to Remark a few Passages, which are clear Confutations of their boasted *Innocency, Plainness, and Christian Charity.*

In the Advertisement to the Reader, G. Whitehead takes notice that *The Quakers Unmask'd, &c.* was sent them in Manuscript in the year 1677. and that Liberty of Conscience being established by Law, and placed upon the Book in writing, is the cause of its now publication. Which (says G. W.) looks as if he envied our present Liberty. Behold the Spirit of the Answerer! Mr. Penman kept his Books unpublished for 13 years together, lest it might be any occasion of the Quakers Persecution; but when Liberty of Conscience is established by Law, he publisheth 10 or 11 of them, presuming there is now no danger of their being persecuted. Does this look as if he envied our present Liberty, and not rather that he was glad of it, as no doubt he is.

In p. 6. to the Reader. 'Our Adversary, again p. 14. (says he) deals very unfairly and unjustly by G. W. about some of our Friends, saying, They give forth Writings from the immediate Eternal Spirit of God, and by the same Spirit and Power that was in the Prophets, Christ, and his Apostles; unto which he fallily addeth, And their so speaking (G. W. saith) is of as great Authority as the Scriptures and Chapters are, and greater; his words (and their so speaking) are J. P.'s own Abuse and Perversion. Now I beseech you, Sir, read the Passage in p. 14. and see wherein

J. P.'s Abuse and Perversion lies. It lies in this, that he added these words [*and their so speaking*] and did not put them in a different Character, to distinguish them from G. W.'s words, though they did not alter the sense at all; if you leave them out, the Passage is as much to the same purpose, as if they were in. Did ever any Writer charge his Adversary with Abuse and Perversion upon so slender an account? What an affront is it to the simple-hearted Reader to write at this rate? This is the Man that in his Letter to J. O. threatens Mr. P. farther to detect and unmask him if he will not be reduced to Christianity. Does he mean by Christianity, Quakerism, which it seems teaches him to use the basest Equivocations and Slights that can be found in any Writer?

Of his Book, p. 3. He utterly denies it as a Slander, that the Quakers formerly exhorted Men to fight and would fight themselves. I must refer you to *The Quakers Unmask'd, &c.* to judge whether that is a Slander, or not? It will abundantly satisfy you, whilst you understand their Writings in the plain honest sense of the Words without their after Equivocations. J. P. cites one of the Quakers Ministers, saying, *We directed all People to the Spirit of God in them, and if that led them to fight, I had nothing against it;* for this, saith G. W. he quotes, fol. 4. but tells us not what Book. But why did he not tell J. P. so 13 years ago when he desired to know what Errors they found in the Quotations, (if there were any;) however to satisfy him that it was a true citation, he took it out of the Quakers Book, where Foreign Letters were recorded, which was first in J. O.'s custody, and afterwards in J. P.'s.

P. 4. The Quakers tell Rich. Protector, 'That if he would walk with the Lord, and preserve his People, then thy Name shall be greater than was thy Father's

A

*Inf*



Fathers, and the numberless number of this [Now] distressed People will be unto thee a strength, and stand by thee, and *Defend thee and thy just Government*. Sir, If you had been Protector, I persuade my self, you would have thought these People would have fought to defend you and your Government: But whatever they or you thought then, the meaning now is, according to G. W. &c. they would defend him and his Government, *By Righteousness, Prayers, and Faith, and by Contributions, Taxes, &c. by the fear of the Lord*, as in the days of *Jehosaphat*. Would you not judge that Man perjured, that should swear Allegiance in such terms, with such a meaning? And must we not take the *Quakers* words for as binding as an Oath?

Next, p. 5. you will please to note what G. W. Answers to the Charge of upbraiding others with that which themselves, for many years, were as deeply concerned and engaged in, &c. 'To all which, saith G. W. I do conscientiously Answer, He hath most grossly and palpably belied the People called *Quakers* in these Passages divers ways. First, in rendering them, without exception of Persons, not only Justifiers of the late Wars, and what had been done therein, without exception of things done, but also equally concerned with the *Presbyterians*, *Independents*, and others therein. But do the *Quakers* when they charge these things upon the *Presbyterians*, &c. make any exception of Persons or Things? And yet it is well known, and it is proved out of their own writings in *The Quakers Unmask'd*, &c. that their Chief Leaders approved of the greatest things done in the late Wars against the King, and to his Person; whereas the *Presbyterians* generally disapproved of them. Besides they say, *their giving forth Papers or Printed Books, is from the immediate eternal Spirit of God, and that their Preachers are guided by an Infalible Spirit, and that they are of one Mind and Judgment*, and the like; and therefore an indefinite, and general charge will affect them more generally than other Parties.

G. W. says, p. 6. 'The War began in 41. and in 48. the King was Beheaded, and all this while no *Quakers* heard of, till about 50. 51. 52. when there was no Wars in England for them to be concerned in, how false then is J. P. to say, The *Quakers* were as much, or more, concerned in the War against the King as any others. But G. W. confesses, that *divers who have been since, and now of us, [Quakers,] have formerly been concerned in the late Wars*. And J. P. has made evident their approbation of what was then done, and that many that turned *Quakers* in the Armies, continued there till they were turned out, that the Protector is blamed for putting them out by G. Fox and others, that they are called, *Sober Men and true Hearts that feared God and trembled at*

*His Word, valiant Captains, Soldiers, and Officers, it may be for saying thou to a single Person, or for wearing their Hats, &c. the distinguishing Characters of Quakers from others*. Whereas, he says, there was no Wars in England in 50. 51. 52. it is a piece of his cunning, and is false; for *Worcester Fight* was in the year 51. and Sir George Booth's Insurrection in 1659. when the *Quakers* gave intelligence, calling them Rebels, for but endeavouring to bring in the King; and for some years there were Wars both in Scotland and Ireland, and upon the Sea, and in Flanders. See *E. Burrough's Alarm Sounded*, &c. 1659. The *Quakers* *Unmask'd*, &c. p. 6. 9. You see then how G. W. Answer is both false and deceitful.

P. 7. 8. G. W. charges J. P. with an apparent hypocrisie in saying, the *Quakers* had been engaged in the same Cause, to as to Preach up Battels, &c. But I pray Sir, what difference is there between Preaching up Battels, &c. and exhorting Generals, Officers, and Soldiers, to go forth against mighty Enemies till they had subdued them, and set up their Standard a top of Rome, and done many other things which were to be done by Fighting? And that in the *Quakers* Spirit See *E. B's Alarm Sounded*, &c. p. 28.

P. 9. 10. G. W. Commends the *Quakers* for their forbearance towards J. P. and as confident that had J. P. look'd upon them as *Fighters*, &c. he durst not have adventured to have given them such frequent and publick occasions of provocations and frequent disturbances and interruptions. To this, J. P. saith, he hath always been careful never to interrupt them, nor to give them any disturbance otherwise than by speaking a few words, either before they began to Preach, or when any one of them had done Preaching, and though the words which he spoke they could not gainsay, but were true; yet because they look'd upon't, that in what he spake he meant them, therefore (notwithstanding his peaceable behaviour) he has sometimes found himself in much danger from the *Quakers*, who have frequently done violence to him themselves, and that in the place where he has a Propriety.

P. 10. They would excuse G. Fox in what he says against an *Earthly King*, &c. by turning it into an *Earthly oppressing King, and setting an Earthly King over them*, p. 11. But did not King Charles the good (to whom they addrest so early, professing their Innocency formerly, and their present Truth and Fidelity to him) challenge the Supreme Power of the Church? Are not all these Elders Christians who will do so much of an *Earthly King* Traytors against Christ? Says G. Fox; And whom did they do so upon but Charles (and afterwards upon King James) whom the *Quakers* do now love, own, and honour? Neither do you read, saith G. F. that there ever was an *Earthly King* since the days of the Apostles, but amongst



amongst the Apostate Christians. So then according to their own Principle, when King Charles 2. was among the Quakers he was among Apostate Christians; or else they temporiz'd and changed their Principles holding that there might be an *Earthly King* among true Christians. And how could they profess their Innocency to the King, and that none had any just cause against them, since they had maintained such Principles as aforesaid? The case of the Prophet Samuel was far different from that of the Quakers, he was chief Magistrate himself, and they a little part of a People that had put to Death their King, and kept out the Heir by Arms, (of both which the Quakers sufficiently approved.) Now, suppose, Samuel had been the Representative of the Quakers, and the Heir made King contrary to his mind and endeavour, would he have addressed him, and said. 'You are not acquainted, O King, with my Principle and Practice, neither have known my Innocency and Sufferings, they that speak against me as a Person that was an Opposer of your Kingship, and did vehemently exhort the People from subjecting themselves to your Arbitrary and Oppressive Power, had no just ground for that Charge. I love, own, and honour you and your Government. Might not the King have answer'd him, Are not you ashamed, Samuel, to play the Hypocrite in this gross manner? Do you brag of your Principle, and Practice, and Innocency before me in this matter, since if the People had acted according to your Principle, and done as you would have had them, I should never have recovered my Kingdom? If you are innocent, who is guilty? Is this your Innocent Plainness? Who then is Equivocating and Deceitful? Your Pride will not suffer you to acknowledge any Error in Principle or Practice, because ye have profess'd to speak and write from the immediate Eternal Spirit of GOD, though you are found fallible and foolish as other Men.

P. 15. The Quakers Unmask'd, is cited, saying, Are not they in their own Judgments become Apostates, for now they say we love, own, and honour an *Earthly King*. G. W. answers, p. 16. And where do we use these very words *Earthly King* on this occasion, but that we love, own, and honour the King, (whom here this Man has judged an *Earthly King*) does this shew us to be Apostates. Remark Did you ever read a more frivolous Answer? Was it any other King but that very King Charles 2. whom they had writ so bitterly against, under the Name of an *Earthly King*? he was an *Earthly King* before, when they said, They were Traitors against Christ that will do so much on an *Earthly King*; but now the Quakers love, own, and honour him, he shall not be called an *Earthly King*. He was an *Earthly King* before when the Episcopal and Presbyterians doted on him; but

now he is become the Quakers King he must be somewhat else; I presume not a Heavenly King; but this is somewhat of the Quakers plainness.

P. 19. G. W. says, 'I am persuaded that reproving him [O C. Protector] for putting such [as feared GOD, sober Men and true Hearts, because of their faithfulness to the LORD,] out of the Army for their Consciences, was MORE upon his breach of Promise, than with an intent to have them always continue in it, in order to War and Fight. Here G. W. or whoever writ this passage, would seem to have some sense of Conscience; for his saying MORE is a comparative with what follows; and argues that it was written with an intent to have had them always to continue in the Army in order to War and Fight, though MORE upon his breach of Promise. I doubt we shall not find G. W. &c. guilty of so much openness again throughout the whole Book. Do not the Quakers hold that none fear GOD truly and rightly but themselves? That they are in the Truth, and none but they; and only among them is GOD known?

Christ was not contradictory to himself in bidding his Disciples to sell their Garments, and buy Swords, and consequently to wear Swords (as Peter did,) because He saith my Kingdom is not of this World, or from hence; but Christ was contradictory to the Quakers sense of that saying, because if it was not lawful to Fight, in any case, Christ would never have bid them buy Swords: But I did not intend to argue the lawfulness of Fighting, only G. W. brings it in needlessly.

P. 21. One of their chiefest Preachers had said, It is no Rebellion to call away those in Power; by which J. P. understands to Depose those in Power that perform not their Trust: G. W. calls this a perverse addition of a meaning, as if to call away and to Depose were both one in common acceptance. But G. W. is not pleased to tell us what other thing was meant by it, and I am persuaded that no Man but a fore-warn'd Quaker will take them for other than both one.

But I must hasten; read his 23 page, and you will find it amount to this, Had you [the Army] been faithful to the Power of the LORD GOD, you had gon into Spain to require the Blood of the Innocent, —and knock'd at Rome Gates, &c. [And done wonderful great things by wicked and unchristian Fighting, or otherwise by the fear and terror of your Power, Arms, and Conquests without Fighting,] or as the Host of the Midianites fled and were overcome, and yet not by Fighting on Gideon's part, but by a mean Stratagem. Quere, Whether they that kill by Stratagem do not Fight? And when the Ephraimites slew Oreb and Zeeb, and brought their Heads to Gideon, and pursued Midian, they did not Fight?



*Judges 7. 25.* And whether *Barack, Jephthah, Samson, David, Samuel*, and the Prophets, who by Faith subdued Kingdoms, and turned to flight the Armies of the Aliens did not Fight? *G. W.* has found out all these ways of an Army's Conquering without Fighting. Sir, I know you are an impartial Man, can you think seriously (not that any Man to whom the *Quakers* wrote, or any Man that should read what they wrote, would understand them in any such sense, without Fighting; for I take it for manifest no Man did; but) whether they that wrote, or even the *Quakers* themselves, (till now they are press'd with these passages,) ever thought of such Senses? And if not, where is the *Quakers* plainness, whereof they so nauseously boast?

P. 24. *G. W.* says, *It cannot consist with our Christian Principle, so much as to avenge our selves.* Who are more ready to avenge themselves in Word and Print than *Quakers*? How have they rail'd and reviled their Opposers? Witness those Names *G. W.* calls *Will. Rogers, F. Bugg, Tho. Crisp* and others, in the Preface to his Book, *Judgment fixed*, viz. *Spottate-Informers, Treacherous Hypocrites, False Brethren, and Deceitful Workers, Betraying Judas's, Devils Incarnate*, who having lost their first love to Truth, and gone out from us, are become degenerate, without Natural Affections, Dogs that are without Moulds, and raging waves of the Sea, that foam out their own shame. And a multitude of other such like Names do they call those that oppose, and cannot conform to their outward Prescriptions and Impositions, besides their frequent violence with their own Hands,

\* See the complaint of one of their own People, touching this matter,

*It hath been their lot to be hated, (with violence) out of the Assemblies,--- Did I think to see the same violence offered in our Assemblies! Nay, but with Sorrow, mine Eyes have seen pulling down, haling out, and thrusting forth of our Meetings, and they went to the utmost, as far as their Power; and doubtless they wanted not Will but Power to punish.*

And although they exercise the Oppressions before-mentioned, (and much more as may be

\* and what is a great part of this Book of *G. W. &c.* but avenging themselves of *J. P.*? They might have said all they had to say in their own vindication, without those manifold reproaches, and even Curses, which they belch out against him, such as that in p. 30 *God will smite thee, thou malicious Hypocrite. Our Innocency shall rise up in Judgment against thee.* Read to the end of that Paragraph. Of this nature is *G. W.* glorying, that *Fer. Ives* not long after his malicious Works against us [*Quakers*] was soon cut off by Death, p. 33.

I must desire you, Sir, to read p. 34, 35, 36, 37. of their Vindication of that Declaration to which *Mr. P.* Name was amongst the rest subscribed, and then judge what *disingenuity and deceit* there was in him, to insert the substance of that Declaration, without telling that his own Name was to it, since his Name was not to those after Declarations, which are inconsistent with this. 2. Whether it is possible to give a more Equivocating Answer to any charge, than *G. W. &c.* has given of this? They say, *God might command Thousands and Ten Thousands of His Saints, at this Day, to Fight in His own Cause &c.* But it must not be taken for granted (says *G. W.*) that therefore he would do it. But that which *GOD* may do, and which we cannot yet believe that He will make use of us in that way, and therefore for the present we are given up to bear and suffer, &c. We must needs conclude that this is one of those things that *GOD* hath made no DECREE to the contrary, but that He may Will it to be done, even by us in the future, though He hath not done it at present. And all that *G. W. &c.* has Criticiz'd upon the Equivocalness of the term *YET*, does but bewray his and their Equivocation; for though *YET* may be taken for Nevertheless, when they say, but

seen in the said Book; yet by their deceitful flatteries, they make People believe, That they are harmless, innocent, and peaceable People, suffering and bearing wrong but not doing any. And if any Person write, or speak their Grief, they will represent them under such terms as may render them odious; and the more effectually to weaken their Testimonies they will fix upon them scurrilous and contemptible Appellations, a *Scotch-Irish, Dutch, Irish, Tinker, Taylor, &c.* Some of them utterly untrue; and to prevent an Inquisition into the matter, they would make People believe, that they are envious, malicious, and discomposed Spirits, bad, dirty, factious, and railing Spirits, who are gone from Truth, and are out of Truth. Such is the Portion of those that appear in the least against their imperious, tyrannical, and lascivious Actions: And whatever Man detected the Fallacies, and destructive Cheats of imperious, disdainful Men, but was thus reproached?

Must it be Justice in them to complain of their Oppressions; and Envy, and Malice, &c. in us to complain of ours? Their years are but few; yet verily they have been exceeding expert to learn of the Papists, Subtilties. Spirit of the Hat, p. 29, 36, 37.

† This passage, and the like, the *Quakers* left out in the reprint of *E. B's* works, knowing



ing (it seems) they would but YET His Kingdom  
expose them in their is not of this World;  
clear sense; but being notwithstanding it cannot  
brought to light, they be so taken, when they say,  
then study to put an equi- neither can we YET be-  
vocal sense on them. lieve, &c. but it must

be taken to denote the  
time to this present [*ad hoc*, *as yet*] in exception to  
the time to come; especially when it is farther ex-  
plained by the clause, *for the present*; which is ne-  
cessarily opposed to the time to come, and imports  
clearly that Fighting may be commanded as in the  
Future, as now bearing and suffering is commanded.  
I am very confident that G. W. &c. cannot produce  
any one instance out of any Man's Writings, that  
understood well the *English* Tongue, of the use of  
the term *Yet*, in such a Phrase and Construction, in  
any other sense than of *Time*. But if all uncon-  
cern'd Readers must and will understand it in this  
sense, then G. W.'s Answer is full of gross Equivo-  
cation.

These are the People that exalt themselves above all  
other Professors, whatsoever, that they reckon all  
them to be of the World, out of the Truth; and them-  
selves the Only People of GOD, and that they are in  
the Truth, and none but they, Christ's Lambs, and  
the like. And for distinguishing themselves from o-  
thers, they took up some Observances, or Ceremonies,  
which did it effectually; such as saying *Thou* not *You*  
to a single Person; calling no Man Master, but John  
or Thomas, &c. not *I thank you*, but *I receive thy*  
*love*; not carrying the Feet but the Head foremost of  
their Dead, and the like. They condemn utterly the  
courtesie of putting off the Hat to any. In short, they  
affected singularity in most things that were customa-  
ry in England, how innocent soever: And under the  
notion of not Swearing, they only refuse the Ceremo-  
ny of an Oath, as the laying the Hand upon, and  
Kissing the Book. Now, I pray Sir, what of true Re-  
ligion, or real Goodness, is there in these things? Sup-  
pose the whole World did observe them, would they  
be at all the better for it? However, by these things  
they have cut off all others, how religious and sincere  
soever. And if any Man oppose what they say or do,  
instead of meekly answering, they are ready with the  
most virulent, opprobrious, and threatening Language  
and Writings that can be found in any sort whatever.  
They will diligently seek out, and take up any thing  
may reproach one; and will insinuate Crimes that  
Men are most free from: Thus have they changed  
the Meekness and Gentleness of Christianity, into  
Fierceness and Churlishness; Humility and Modesty,  
into Arrogance and Self-conceit; Peaceableness into  
Contentiousness; Mildness into Clamour; and Blessing

into evil-speaking and reviling; Plainness and Simpli-  
city, into Equivocation and Craft; and all this under  
the Profession of the most unspotted Innocency  
and Sincerity. Truth, Righteousness, and Holiness.

But I would not be understood to impute these  
Immoralities to the Quakers in general, nor to all  
their Teachers and Leading Men, but to the Foxonian  
Party that love to Govern and have the Preheminence,  
who have endeavoured to suppress those who have  
at any time proposed any thing contrary to their  
Sentiments. Thus in a few years, instead of being  
led and guided, and being obedient every one to  
the Light in himself, they were obliged to submit  
to the sense of the greater number of the Governing  
BODY, though never so contrary to their own sense.  
Nay, this Imposing Spirit proceeded so far, at a  
Quarterly Meeting in Barbadoes, where they did  
not act with that Caution and Cunning as here at  
London, that they made and subscribed this following  
Order, viz.

'I desire to give up my whole Concern,  
'if required, both *Spiritual* and *Temporal*  
'unto the Spirit of God in Men and Wo-  
'men's Meetings, as believing it to be more  
'according to the Universal Wisdom of  
'God, than any particular measure in my  
'self, or any particulars with whom the  
'Men and Women's Meetings have not  
'Unity.

The Actings, Writings, and Speakings of that  
kind I have spoken of, being observed by some  
\* among them, who  
were either too wise, or  
too honest to be per-  
suaded, that those cor-  
rupt Fruits could pro-  
ceed either from the Spi-  
rit of God, or from the  
Light within, that they  
griev'd and mourn'd to see that excellent Prin-  
ciple of Reformation, *The Light in every Man*,  
so grossly perverted and undermined, that they  
were made to oppose and testify against them.

Sir, I might go on throughout G. W.'s &c. whole  
Book, and shew many more gross Equivocations,  
Palliations, and Deceits; but I will not proceed far-  
ther, lest I may seem to question your Judgment,  
in not observing those things that are so evident.  
But I think we that read Books have just cause of in-  
dignation against those Quakers, who have the face to  
impose upon the World such abominable Stuff, un-  
der the Notion of the Teachings of the Light, of  
these

\* W. Rogers, T. Crisp,  
F. Bugg, W. Macklow,  
J. Story, J. Wilkinson,  
Charles Harris, J. Rance,  
Tho. Curris, J. Anslow,  
and many more.



*Judges 7. 25.* And whether *Barack, Jephthah, Samson, David, Samuel,* and the Prophets, who by Faith subdued Kingdoms, and turned to flight the Armies of the Aliens did not Fight? *G. W.* has found out all these ways of an Army's Conquering without Fighting. Sir, I know you are an impartial Man, can you think seriously (not that any Man to whom the *Quakers* wrote, or any Man that should read what they wrote, would understand them in any such sense, without Fighting; for I take it for manifest no Man did; but) whether they that wrote, or even the *Quakers* themselves, (till now they are pref'd with these passages,) ever thought of such Senses? And if not, where is the *Quakers* plainness, whereof they so nauseously boast?

*P. 24.* *G. W.* says, *It cannot consist with our Christian Principle, so much as to avenge our selves.* Who are more ready to avenge themselves in Word and Print than *Quakers*? How have they rail'd and reviled their Opposers? Witness those Names *G. W.* calls *Will. Rogers, F. Bugg, Tho. Crisp* and others, in the Preface to his Book, *Judgment fixed, viz. Apostate Informers, Treacherous Hypocrites, False Brethren, and Decent-1 Markers, Betraying Judas's Devils Incarnate,* who having lost their first love to Truth, and gone out from us, are become degenerate, without Natural Affections, Dogs that are without Moulders, and rising waves of the Sea, that foam out their own shame. And a multitude of other such like Names do they call those that oppose, and cannot conform to their outward Prescriptions and Impositions, besides their frequent violence with their own Hands,

\* See the complaint of one of their own People, touching this matter.

*It hath been their lot to be hated, (with violence) out of the Assemblies,--- Did I think to see the same violence offered in our Assemblies! Nay, but with Sorrow, mine Eyes have seen pulling down, haling out, and thrusting forth of our Meetings, and they went to the utmost, as far as their Power; and doubtless they wanted not Will but Power to punish.*

And although they exercise the Oppressions before-mentioned, (and much more as may be

and what is a great part of this Book of *G. W. &c.* but avenging themselves of *J. P.*? They might have said all they had to say in their own vindication, without those manifold reproaches, and even Curses, which they belch out against him, such as that in p. 31. *God will smite thee, thou malicious Hypocrite. Our Innocency shall rise up in Judgment against thee.* Read to the end of that Paragraph. Of this nature is *G. W.* glorying, that *Jer. Ives* not long after his malicious Works against us [*Quakers*] was soon cut off by Death, p. 33.

I must desire you, Sir, to read p. 34, 35, 36, 37. of their Vindication of that Declaration to which *Mr. P.* Name was amongst the rest subscribed, and then judge what *dissimulity* and *deceit* there was in him, to insert the substance of that Declaration, without telling that his own Name was to it, since his Name was not to those after Declarations, which are inconsistent with this. 2. Whether it is possible to give a more Equivocating Answer to any charge, than *G. W. &c.* has given of this? They say, *God might command Thousands and Ten Thousands of His Saints, at this Day, to Fight in His own Cause.* But it must not be taken for granted (says *G. W.*) that therefore he would do it. But that which *GOD* may do, and which we cannot yet believe that He will make use of us in that way, and therefore for the present we are given up to bear and suffer, &c. We must needs conclude that this is one of those things that *GOD* hath made no DECREE to the contrary, but that He may Will it to be done, even by us in the future, though He hath not done it at present. And all that *G. W. &c.* has Criticiz'd upon the Equivocalness of the term *YET*, does but bewray his and their Equivocation; for though *YET* may be taken for Nevertheless, when they say,

seen in the said Book; yet by their deceitful flatteries, they make People believe, That they are harmless, innocent, and praiseworthy, suffering and bearing wrong but not doing any. And if any Person write, or speak their Grief, they will represent them under such terms as may render them odious; and the more effectually weaken their Testimony they will fix upon them scurrilous and contemptible Appellations, a *Scotch-Irish, Dutch, or English, Taylor, &c.* Some of them utterly untrue, and so prevent an Inquisition into the matter, they would make People believe, that they are envious, malicious, and discompos'd spirits, bad, bitter, factious, and ranting spirits, who are gone from Truth, and are out of Truth. Such is the Portion of those that appear in the least against their imperious, tyrannical, and lascivious Actions: And whatever Man detected the Fallacies, and destructive Cheats of imperious, disdainful Men, but was thus reproached?

Must it be Justice in them to complain of their Oppressions; and Envy, and Malice, &c. in us to complain of ours? Their years are but few; yet verily they have been exceeding expert to learn of the Papists, Subtilties. Spirit of the Hat, p. 29. 36, 37.

† This passage, and the like, the *Quakers* left out in the reprint of *E. B's* works, known-



## to The Quakers Unmask'd.

ing (it seems) they would but YET His Kingdom  
expose them in their *not of this World*;  
clear sense; but being notwithstanding it cannot  
brought to light, they be so taken, when they say,  
that study to put an aque- neither can we YET be-  
vocal sense on them. lieve, &c. but it must

be taken to denote the  
time to this present [*ad hoc, as yet*] in exception to  
the time to come; especially when it is farther ex-  
plained by the clause, *for the present*; which is ne-  
cessarily opposed to the time to come, and imports  
clearly that Fighting may be commanded as in the  
Future, as now bearing and suffering is commanded.  
I am very confident that G. W. &c. cannot produce  
any one instance out of any Man's Writings, that  
understood well the *English* Tongue, of the use of  
the term *Yet*, in such a Phrase and Construction, in  
any other sense than of *Time*. But if all uncon-  
cern'd Readers must and will understand it in this  
sense, then G. W.'s Answer is full of gross Equivo-  
cation.

These are the People that exalt themselves above all  
other Professors, whatsoever, that they reckon all  
them to be of the World, out of the Truth; and them-  
selves the Only People of GOD, and that they are in  
the Truth, and none but they, Christ's Lambs, and  
the like. And for distinguishing themselves from o-  
thers, they took up some Observances, or Ceremonies,  
which did it effectually; such as saying *Thou not You*  
to single Person; calling no Man Master, but John  
or Thomas, &c. not *I thank you*, but *I receive thy*  
*love*; not carrying the Feet but the Head foremost of  
the Dead, and the like. They condemn utterly the  
courtesie of putting off the Hat to any. In short, they  
affected singularity in most things that were customa-  
ry in England, how innocent soever: And under the  
notion of not Swearing, they only refuse the Ceremo-  
ny of an Oath, as the laying the Hand upon, and  
kissing the Book. Now, I pray Sir, what of true Re-  
ligion, or real Goodness, is there in these things? Sup-  
pose the whole World did observe them, would they  
be at all the better for it? However, by these things  
they have cut off all others, how religious and sincere  
soever. And if any Man oppose what they say or do,  
instead of meekly answering, they are ready with the  
most virulent, opprobrious, and threatening Language  
and Writings that can be found in any sort whatever.  
They will diligently seek out, and take up any thing  
may reproach one; and will insinuate Crimes that  
Men are most free from: Thus have they changed  
the Meekness and Gentleness of Christianity, into  
Fierceness and Churlishness; Humility and Modesty,  
into Arrogance and Self-conceit; Peaceableness into  
Contentiousness; Mildness into Clamour; and Blessing

into evil-speaking and reviling; Plainness and Simpli-  
city, into Equivocation and Craft; and all this under  
the Profession of the most Unspotted Innocency  
and Sincerity. Truth, Righteousness, and Holiness.

But I would not be understood to impute these  
Immoralities to the Quakers in general, nor to all  
their Teachers and Leading Men, but to the *Populace*  
Party that love to Govern and have the Preheminence,  
who have endeavoured to suppress those who have  
at any time proposed any thing contrary to their  
Sentiments. Thus in a few years, instead of being  
led and guided, and being obedient every one to  
the Light in himself, they were obliged to submit  
to the sense of the greater number of the Governing  
BODY, though never so contrary to their own sense:  
Nay, this Imposing Spirit proceeded so far, at a  
Quarterly Meeting in *Barbadoes*, where they did  
not act with that Caution and Cunning as here at  
*London*, that they made and subscribed the following  
Order, viz.

‘I desire to give up my whole Concern,  
‘if required, both *Spiritual* and *Temporal*  
‘unto the Spirit of God in Men and Wo-  
‘men's Meetings, as believing it to be more  
‘according to the Universal Wisdom of  
‘God, than any particular measure in my  
‘self, or any particulars with whom the  
‘Men and Women's Meetings have not  
‘Unity.

The Actings, Writings, and Speakings of that  
kind I have spoken of, being observed by some  
\* among them, who  
were either too wise, or  
too honest to be per-  
suaded, that those cor-  
rupt Fruits could pro-  
ceed either from the Spi-  
rit of God, or from the  
Light within, that they  
griev'd and mourn'd to see that excellent Prin-  
ciple of Reformation, *The Light in every Man*,  
so grossly perverted and undermined, that they  
were made to oppose and testify against them.

Sir, I might go on throughout G. W.'s *Whole*  
Book, and shew many more gross Equivocations,  
Palliations, and Deceits; but I will not proceed far-  
ther, lest I may seem to question your Judgment,  
in not observing those things that are so evident.  
But I think we that read Books have just cause of in-  
dignation against those Quakers, who have the face to  
impose upon the World such abominable Stuff, un-  
der the Notion of the Teachings of the Light, of  
these



the unpotted Innocency and Christian sincerity. But it may reasonably be thought they write not for vindication of themselves to those that are of the World, (as they call all that are not in their Form;) but for their own Party, that are so blindly addicted to their Leaders, that they swallow every thing they

say without consideration: Unhappy Men! that have given up their Minds to the Glory of a single Party, in contempt of all others, and can find no other way of vindicating themselves. I may need your excuse for writing so much, and therefore will now subscribe

May 23.

1691.

Sir, Yours

A. C.

## POSTSCRIPT.

SIR,

**A**ND besides what I said about Fighting, I am credibly informed, that some *Quakers* have not only fought, but that with great Courage and Magnanimity. The first I shall mention is Mr. *William Mead* an eminent Person, who being set upon by three High-way-men, and having only a Cudgel, or Staff, in his Hand, did not only bravely defend himself therewith, but knock'd down one of the Robbers so wounded, that the other were forced to carry him away, whilst Mr. *Mead* escaped their Hands. The next shall be one *Matthew Renshaw* (Master of a Ship,) who fought both with great and small Guns, till he was overpowered by the *Turks*. Another, one *John Thompson*, who fought exceeding stoutly, and killed a great many Men before he was taken by the Enemy. These two Masters were not only *Quakers* themselves, but their Owners generally, if not every one, such. More might be named, but these suffice to shew that the *Quakers* will fight in a just Cause, and that stoutly too; which puts me in mind again of *G. Fox To the Council of Officers, &c. p. 5.* who says (of those that had been put out of the Army for being *Quakers*.) *Of whom it hath been said among you, that they had rather have had one of them than 7 Men, and could have turned one of them to seven Men.*

And since my writing the above, I have spoken with Mr. *Pennyman* touching the Accusation against *Stephen Crisp*, mentioned in *The Quakers Unmask'd*, folio p. 14. and which in their *Answer*, p. 14. they say, *Steph. Crisp* absolutely denies, that he either forced him, or that the Party did shew any dissatisfaction before he Signed and Sealed the said Paper. What shall we say to these Men, who not only use Equivocations in their Writing, but do absolutely deny matter of Fact? to which Mr. *Pennyman* was an Eye and Ear Witness, and is ready to attest it, if called thereto; but would not then subscribe as a Witness, being greatly dissatisfied with the unworthiness of the demand.

I will add here something concerning the Nature of an Oath, whereby it may appear that the *Quakers* are mistaken about it.



## Of the Nature of an Oath.

**W**hen the Author to the *Hebrews* says (*Ch. 6. 16.*) *Men verily Swear by the greater; and an Oath for Confirmation is to them an end of all strife*; he plainly shews us, that an Oath is the greatest and utmost Evidence of Truth and Sincerity that can be given; for if a Man openly appeals to GOD, who searcheth the Heart, and therefore knows not only what is outward in Men's Words and Actions, but their most inward thoughts, that Man gives the utmost assurance he can possibly give; for he that falsifies in the presence of Men, calling them for Witnesses, who know the matter, and whose office it is to ludge and punish, incurs all that reproach, infamy and other punishments, which so great an offence and abuse deserves: So he that falsifies in the presence of God, calling Him for Witness, incurs the greatest punishments of Divine Vengeance, as one that makes God Almighty a Partner and Confederate to a Lie, presumptuously and to his very face. So that however God perhaps is not expressly invoked to do vengeance upon him, yet in appealing to God as a Witness, that is implied, because He is such a Witness as is also the Supreme Judge, whose Justice and Truth is herein appealed to. Therefore calling God to Witness is as much an Oath as any other form of Words, as having as much evidence and assurance as any other Form whatever, and as great Penalties attending it. Now to assert any thing in the presence of Men expressly, is all one as to call them for Witnesses: So also to assert any thing in the presence of God expressly, is all one as to call God for Witness.

*Farther see several Forms of an Oath. viz.*

**I** Do hereby testifie in the Truth of my Heart, and in the Presence of HIM that knoweth all things, and in the Presence of these Faithful Witnesses,\* &c. Or, GOD is my Witness. I call GOD to record on my Soul. The GOD and Father of our LORD Jesus Christ knows that I lye not. GOD is Witness between me and thee. Any of which (or the like) without laying the Hand on the Book, or other Ceremony, or more Words, is not only an Oath, but, [as saith a knowing, judicious, and worthy Person,] if Authorized by Act of Parliament, is as much a Legal Oath as any now in use amongst us.

\*[The Quakers Form.]  
See 2<sup>d</sup> Unm.  
folio, p. 14.

And as the *Quakers* have been mistaken about an Oath, so they have been about their paying of Taxes, in that they allow'd and paid the *Royal Aid Tax*, and that of carrying on the War against the *Dutch*, and the like; yet they would not pay towards the Trained Bands, notwithstanding they are chiefly intended for a Defence; and the other not only to Defend but to offend our Neighbours, as the Government sees cause. So that 'tis plain, the Tax they then refused was more justifiable than that they allowed and paid, inasmuch as to Defend is more allowable and justifiable than to Offend.